

THE DECISIONS TO CLOSE AND REOPEN THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI PRESS: A REVIEW OF PROCESSES

**Review Prepared by the Ad Hoc Root Cause(s) Committee
Appointed by the MU Faculty Council on University Policy**

Members:

**Dr. Arthur G. Jago (Chair)
Dr. Sudarshan Loyalka
Dr. Douglas Wakefield
Dr. William Wiebold
Dr. Russ Zguta**

March 14, 2013

“The President shall be the chief executive and academic officer of the University and all faculty and other University employees shall be under his/her control and supervision, and he/she shall be in charge of all academic, public, business, financial and related affairs of the University under the policies and general supervision of the Board.”

– Section 20.020 UM System Collected Rules and Regulations

THE DECISIONS TO CLOSE AND REOPEN THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI PRESS: A REVIEW OF PROCESSES

The following is the report of the Root Cause(s) committee formed in October 2012 by the MU Faculty Council on University Policy to examine the decision-making processes of the spring and summer of 2012 related to the University of Missouri Press (hereafter “Press”). This report is fact-finding and contains no proposed action items. It does offer learning points / take-aways.

COMMITTEE CHARGE

The committee charge was to examine the decision-making processes within the context of shared governance that led to the decision to close the Press, layoff its employees, and cease future publications and then to transfer the Press to the MU campus, rehire its employees, and seek continued manuscript development and publication. The charge was not to evaluate the substance of any decision, the committee being agnostic on such issues. The purpose was to determine the academic content or relevance of such decisions, the involvement of faculty representatives in those decisions, and whether that involvement was sufficient in scope and depth.

COMMITTEE PROCESS

The committee reviewed available documents related to the Missouri Press and conducted 24 meetings. Eighteen individuals involved in Press-related discussions were interviewed (Appendix A). All of these meetings were individual interviews, with the exception of System personnel housed in University Hall. At the request of President Wolfe we met with him and his senior staff as a group.

Only one person that we asked to meet with us refused our request. That was Ben George, a 2012 consultant to the UM System. At the time of his MU engagement, he was an assistant adjunct professor of creative writing at the University of North Carolina – Wilmington and in his second year as editor of *Ecotone*, a semi-annual literary magazine.¹ When the committee contacted him to propose a phone interview, he was employed by Penguin Press.

¹ At one time, Mr. George was also Editorial Director of Lookout Books, a UNC-Wilmington publisher of four books.

DECISION SUBSTANCE

Having noted that this committee was not charged with evaluating the content of any decision, we nonetheless recognize and wish to note that any such evaluation hinges critically on the value that one places on the benefits that a press brings to the university and the costs it incurs. The net financial cost of the UM Press is clear and was often cited – a \$400,000 yearly subsidy or subvention from the University System.² The requirement of a press subsidy is not unique to UM. Only the University of Chicago Press, with 6000 books in print, is thought to be a profitable U.S. university press (*New York Times*, July 17, 2012) and even that claim was questioned by one of our interviewees.³

The potential benefits that a press brings to the university are its scholarly contributions to the academy, and the prestige it brings to the institution. A university press advances scholarly discourse and becomes a node in a network of information creation and dissemination. It is a facet of a scholarly “ecosystem” (to use an analogy offered by the President’s office) that represents an intangible asset to the University. It places the university into the very best libraries of the world. With specific reference to our Press, a consultant to the System noted:

The [UM] Press has a large list of important academic and regional titles, many of which have won awards. It has a backlist of approximately 1,000 titles that should provide stable sales income for some time to come. This excellent list of books is important not only from an income perspective but as a tool in the University’s outreach efforts. Worldwide, the Press sells over 100,000 books per year, and the University of Missouri imprint is on each one. If you equate each title with a course, and each purchaser with a student, the University of Missouri Press teaches 1,000 courses to over 100,000 students around the world each year. That is an outstanding return to the University’s investment.

-- A.M. Adkins (December, 2008)

As President Wolfe commented to us, a grocer can feature jelly as a loss leader if it produces off-setting profits in the sale of bread and peanut butter. However, unlike the grocer, the secondary benefits of a press are intangible. We therefore recognize that reasonable people can reasonably disagree as to whether the benefits of the Press justify its costs, including the opportunity costs of not using those resources elsewhere.

² Opportunity costs are far more difficult to assess. Because university budgets are usually zero-sum, funds spent on the Press means less funds available for other entities or programs. Therefore, the issues surrounding the Press involve more stakeholders than just Press employees and the authors they serve. The assessment of the balance between costs and benefits becomes more complex, and the need for wider input increases.

³ The American Association of University Presses cites a membership of 134 scholarly presses.

Appendix B lists some sources that further discuss the costs and benefits of a university press.

THE COMMITTEE'S FINDINGS

The essential elements of the committee's fact-finding can be summarized in the answers to a variety of questions:

(1) *Did President Wolfe have the authority to close the Press unilaterally and without faculty input?*

Yes.

President Wolfe announced the closure of the Press in one item imbedded in a press release issued May 24, 2012. The majority of faculty/administrators we interviewed expressed "surprise" if not "shock" upon hearing the decision.

The Press is an ancillary or auxiliary enterprise.⁴ The System convincingly makes the case that the Press may be related to – but is not a part of – the core mission of the university and is not governed by "Discontinuance of Program or Department of Instruction" (Section 320.150 of the CRR). As was stated to us by an Assistant Vice President, there was no requirement under this or any other provision of the CRR for faculty input to be solicited prior to a decision to abolish the Press. The President therefore had the authority to close the Press by executive order.

⁴ However, the Press is quite unique among university entities. It is specifically created, authorized, and governed by its own sections in the Collected Rules and Regulations (CRR, Sections 170.020 and 170.025). Academic programs, departments, and colleges are not afforded such distinction.

The Press publishes in many areas including, American and World History; Intellectual History; Biography; Journalism; African American Studies; Women's Studies; American, British, and Latin American Literary Criticism; Journalism; Political Science, particularly Philosophy and Ethics; Regional Studies of the American Heartland; and Creative Nonfiction. Perhaps its best known titles are: *The Collected Works of Langston Hughes*, *The Complete Sermons of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, and *Mark Twain and His Circle*. It is also known for a variety of book series including: *The American Military Experience Series* (J.C. McManus, ed.), the *Collected Works of Eric Voegelin*, the *Eric Voegelin Institute Series in Political Philosophy*, the *Give 'Em Hell Harry Series* (R.H. Ferrell, ed.), the *Missouri Biography Series* (W.E. Foley, ed.), the *Missouri Heritage Readers Series* (R.B. Schroeder, ed.), the *Shades of Blue and Gray Series* (H. Hattaway, J. Wakelyn, and C. E. Jewett, eds.), the *Sports and American Culture Series* (R. Launius, ed.), and the *Southern Women Series* (T. Perdue, B. Brandon, and V. Bernhard, eds.). [Source: UM Press website]

(2) *Lacking any requirement to do so, did the System nonetheless consult faculty representatives regarding the closing of the Press?*

No.

Another provision of the CRR states that UM faculty members, through the vehicle of the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC), “shall participate in education policy determination about those matters which are University-wide” (300.010 G.1.a). This provision is not explicit as to the definition or scope of “education policy” to which it applies yet it suggests that IFC might be expected to participate – somehow -- in a significant decision involving the Press as a related, although ancillary, academic activity. Presumably, IFC could expect to have been consulted.

A senior System administrator stated that the IFC was routinely advised of Press issues and IFC’s input regarding the Press was sought over the years. However, IFC minutes for the past several years do not reflect any mention of the Press. Several IFC members, with terms spanning the last 10 years, could not recall any mention of the Press at any of their meetings.

Although not IFC, there was an informal group of carefully chosen individuals from the System and MU (who then augmented the group with their own selection of participants) that was brought together to discuss the Press. It has been variously described by participants as:

- a committee,
- not a committee,
- a task force,
- a brainstorming group,
- a group of collected minds,
- people who would come and go,
- Steve Graham’s group,
- Brian Foster’s group,
- Steve and Brian’s group,
- a group of administrators plus two or three faculty members,
- everyone but representatives of the Press,
- legitimation for a decision,
- “window dressing”,
- part of a “fait accompli” or a “done deal”,
- a “happening!”.

Our best determination is that it was a group of about 12 people assembled by Senior Associate Vice-President Steve Graham to discuss “The Future of the Press.” It certainly was not a formal committee in that it had no specific charge, no agendas, and no minutes. It did not keep records of attendance or of business. It received no reports nor issued any reports. Its membership was not construed to include broad faculty representation. It apparently met on five occasions between mid-October 2011 and

mid-January 2012. The final meeting was not announced as the final meeting; the group was simply never again convened. Attendance varied from meeting to meeting (from some participants attending only a part of one meeting to those attending all five). While it was an eclectic group, there was no participation by any Press employees. It would be incorrect to describe it as a private, secret, or confidential group; its membership was large and varied and the discussions were frank. However, neither can this group be described as open, transparent, or inclusive.

Whatever this group's purpose, it was not to advise the System on a possible decision to close the Press. According to participants, closure may have been mentioned as the worst case scenario if the university did nothing, but it was never seriously considered by the group as an action alternative. It was a last resort, an outcome to be avoided. Opinions or reactions regarding potential closure were not systematically examined by this group.

Moreover, it can in no way be construed as "faculty consultation" of any type regarding any matter. There are well established bodies and mechanisms for faculty consultation throughout every level of the university. Neither System nor MU administrators availed themselves of any of the procedures for seeking the views or opinions of faculty through any existing mechanisms. Faculty consultation simply was not sought nor obtained.

President Wolfe told us that, in consulting with the campus's Chancellors and Provosts, he expected them to have consulted with their respective faculty, staff, and students. He assumed that their reports to him would include the views of various campus groups.

(3) Did an exigency prevent faculty consultation?

No.

System administration told us that the Press was "on life support" or "running on fumes." It was described as a "house on fire" or a "sinking ship that was also on fire." On top of this, System officials cite Governor Nixon's "State of the State" address (January 17, 2012) that forecasted a devastating 12.5% cut to the budget of the University System and its four campuses as critical to the decision to close the Press..

However, senior administrators on campuses throughout the System told us that the Press subsidy was a perennial discussion issue. There was no more of an emergency in October 2011 – or in May 2012 -- than in any prior year going back to 2008 or earlier.

(4) Did a personnel decision preclude faculty consultation?

No.

Missouri law allows, but does not require, that personnel actions affecting specific public employees can be held without public discussion.⁵ Clearly if the Press were to be closed, layoffs could be expected. However so would a decision to close or outsource any auxiliary enterprise (e.g., on the MU campus, such enterprises include the research reactor, the bookstore, the athletic department, the hospital, campus dining, parking). MU standing campus committees exist for many of these operations (e.g., the athletic committee, the parking committee). These, or in their absence an ad hoc committee, would routinely be consulted with regard to any of these enterprises. There is no compelling reason that the far smaller University Press, with significantly greater scholarly impact, would pose more sensitive personnel issues. It should be noted that strategic System discussions that might result in layoffs because of the elimination or reclassification of multiple positions, do routinely incorporate broader campus participation. Thus, the potential closure should not have precluded constituent or stakeholder input; in fact, it should have magnified the need for faculty consultation.

(5) *Was the decision to keep the Press open and move it to the MU campus, the result of actions by the MU Faculty Council or because of other faculty input?*

Probably not.

The Faculty Council, at its July 26, 2012, meeting, voted to ask President Wolfe to postpone the decision to close the Press pending further discussion with faculty. This seems to have had little impact on any events

Immediately following the May 24 announcement to close the Press, there was vocal criticism of the decision from many individual faculty members. However, we were told by several interviewees that such faculty alarm only represented a minority view. We were repeatedly told that most faculty members were unaware of the existence of the Press and, if polled, a large majority would favor its closure if it could save a \$400,000 subsidy. In fact, MU administrators volunteered that they were sharply criticized by some faculty members for taking on an unprofitable auxiliary enterprise that was being discarded by the System.

As late as August 3, President Wolfe was firm that he would not reverse his decision to close the Press. However, as early as July 17 there was speculation that lawsuits from existing authors (and those under contract) could reduce annual revenue by \$800,000 if

⁵ Missouri's Open Meeting Act ("Sunshine Law") permits, but does not require, that the System close its meetings regarding the "hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting a particular employee" [Section 610.021(3), emphasis added].

they prevailed in court in requesting the return of their intellectual properties (*Tribune*, 07/17/12, 12/30/12).⁶

The math apparently suggested that keeping the Press open would require the continuation of its annual \$400,000 subsidy; however, closing the press might double that expenditure. It seem that both the decision to close the Press and then to reopen it were primarily financial/legal decisions. University attorneys were given the opportunity to talk with us about this and other issues, but they declined citing “attorney/client privilege.”

(6) Was outside expert opinion regarding Press closure sought?

Yes, from one individual.

As noted in this report, in January of 2012 the System did seek the expert opinion of Ben George, an adjunct assistant professor of literature from the University of North Carolina – Wilmington. He advocated closing the Press as it existed and creating a new vehicle, perhaps a “boutique” press, on the MU Campus and possibly under the same publication structure as *The Missouri Review* (within the English Department, College of Arts and Science). Some of our interviewees challenged his expertise and credentials; others felt he was trying to parlay a consulting opportunity into a job offer.

Much earlier (2008-2009), the System brought five other consultants to Columbia to examine the Press. Each was an expert in a different element of scholarly press management and operation. However, unlike George, none were asked to specifically evaluate the option of closing the Press. Some conclusions that they did reach:

- “Current staff have the necessary expertise and skill and “are eager to seize this opportunity to make much-needed changes to systems, work flow, and philosophy to create a viable press of the next century”
- “The current management team at UMP is a very professional and knowledgeable group “ with “a lot of university press publishing experience and are very competent to lead the Press during this time of transition”
- “Missouri has very good, very knowledgeable people in or moving into all of its key positions.... The Press’s organizational structure is much like that of many other university presses, a structure that has stood the test of time.... [The Press has] a sound set of operating policies and procedures...”

⁶ Citing a private email, Jane Henderson of the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* reports that 58 authors had requested the return of copyright to their 138 titles (http://www.stltoday.com/entertainment/books-and-literature/book-blog/missouri-press-rehires-editor/article_6de60146-0f12-11e2-8c93-0019bb30f31a.html)

Although the consultants recommended some very specific cost-saving measures (e.g. inventory levels, marketing budgets, pricing, out-sourcing copyediting and typesetting), they seemed to agree that, as one stated, “no university press can be totally self-supporting.” System documents indicate that 85 of the 134 consultant recommendations were implemented.

LESSON LEARNED / TAKE-AWAYS

The processes used to make these Press decisions were clumsy and opaque and could have been improved. Our findings suggest several specific learning points:

- (1) Administration and faculty need a common understanding of the meaning of “faculty consultation” under the by-law provisions of advisory authority, and a further understanding of when and how to achieve such consultation. At the System level, the assumption that Chancellors and Provosts represent the faculty, students, and staff on their particular campuses is without merit. Without specific use of appropriate mechanisms to obtain input from stakeholder groups, Chancellors and Provosts can only provide their own personal perspectives and opinions to their administrative superiors in the university hierarchy.⁷ Representative groups (e.g., Faculty Council, Graduate Faculty Senate, IFC) exist to be the voice of faculty to various campus and System administrative offices.
- (2) Beyond agreeing about who the key participants in such consultations should be, a common understanding is also needed regarding the *process* of consultation. Consultation is meeting with representatives: (a) before a decision is reached; and, (b) with that meeting providing an opportunity for input and opinions with the full nature and scope of the circumstance shared. Consultation does not require that the decision-maker concede to the wishes of those involved, but does require that any information or positions expressed by those consulted be considered before a final decision is made.
- (3) The Collected Rules and Regulations (CRR) are black and white, but the complexities and issues facing the complex academic ecosystem of the modern university are not. The intent of the Collected Rules should be recognized. The CRR should not be used exclusively to mandate minimum behaviors with a specific set of rules covering all possible situations. Rather the CRR should be used to provide a set of overarching principles to guide us when issues are less than clear cut.

⁷ . Moreover, parallel logic can be applied throughout the university hierarchy (e.g., a Provost’s consultation with the Dean of X College, is not his/her consultation with the faculty of X College)

- (4) Some of those we have interviewed have articulated the value of consulting with experts who bring specialized knowledge to bear on an issue. This has undeniable benefits. However, some of these same people have further suggested that involving those without expertise is a waste of time. On occasion, perhaps; but at other times, broad-based consultation is an important vehicle for producing commitment to or acceptance of a course of action – the buy-in of those for whom such commitment is required if the decision is to succeed. In this particular series of events, those groups might have included faculty members (both those who have and have not published in the Press), deans, authors, press personnel, and the larger publishing community (with some of these groups involved more than others).
- (5) The role of the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC) needs to be clarified and further formalized in regard to its consultative role. Perhaps using the MU Faculty Bylaws as a model, the broad categories where IFC has primary (direct), shared, advisory and delegated decision-making authorities should be specified. Such categories would bring clarification to System shared governance and might help to avoid some of the non-constructive conflict experienced in the case study we have examined in this report.

Appendix A: Interviewees

Dwight Browne
Interim Director (Retired), UM Press

John Budd
Professor, Information Science & Learning Technologies

Daniel Clay
Dean, College of Education

James Cogswell
Director, MU Libraries

Brady Deaton
Chancellor, MU

Gary Ebersole
Chair, History, UMKC
Former Chair, Intercampus Faculty Council

Brian Foster
Provost, MU

Steven Graham
Senior Assoc. Vice President, Academic Affairs, UM

Nikki Krawitz
Vice-President, Finance & Administration, UM

Dean Mills
Dean, School of Journalism

Speer Morgan
Professor, English

Deborah Noble-Triplett
Asst. Vice President, Academic Affairs, UM

Michael O'Brien
Dean, Arts & Science

Thomas Quirk
Professor, English

David Read
Chair, English

Robert Schwartz
Chief of Staff, UM

Clair Willcox
Editor-In-Chief / Assoc. Director, UM Press

Timothy Wolfe
President, UM

The following were also contacted by e-mail and asked to address any involvement they may have had in the UM/MU Press decisions. These individuals were brought to our attention in discussions or documents reviewed by the committee: Gary Allen (UM Vice President, Information Technology), Scott Cairns (MU Professor, English), Glen Cope (Provost, UMSL), Gail Hackett (Provost, UMKC), Nancie Hawke (Counsel, UM General Counsel Office), Phil Hoskins (Deputy Counsel, UM General Counsel Office), Pat Morton (Planning Assistant, MU Provost Office), Ann Riley (Assistant Director of Technical Services, MU Libraries), and Warren Wray (Provost, Missouri S&T).

Appendix B: Cost / Benefit of University Presses

Di Leo, J.R. (June 19, 2012). When University Presses Fail. *Inside Higher Ed*. (<http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2012/06/19/essay-closure-university-missouri-press>).

Esposito, J.J. (2007). The Wisdom of Oz: The Role of the University Press in Scholarly Communications. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 10(1), (<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/j/jep/3336451.0010.103/--wisdom-of-oz-the-role-of-the-university-press-in-scholarly?rgn=main;view=fulltext;q1=wisdom+of+oz>).

Regier, W.G. (February 22, 2002). Great University Presses Make Greater Presidents. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (<http://chronicle.com/article/Great-University-Presses-Make/13996/>).

Schiffrin, A. (June 18, 1999). Payback Time: University Presses as Profit Centers. *Chronicle of Higher Education* (<http://chronicle.com/article/Payback-Time-University/2625/>).

Appendix C: Event Timeline

Mid-October, 2011, through Mid-January, 2012

Five meetings are called by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Steven Graham to bring together Columbia-campus administrators and faculty members to discuss the “Future of the UM Press.” The last meeting (January 17, 2012) brings to campus Ben George, an adjunct assistant professor of literature from the University of North Carolina -Wilmington, as a consultant to the System. January 17 coincides with the day of the “State of the State” annual address by Missouri Governor Jay Nixon.

February 15, 2012

Tim Wolfe becomes President of the University of Missouri.

March 19

Consultant Ben George sends a three-page memo to Steve Graham with recommendations for a new Press, telling Graham “I think the situation in Columbia would be exciting to a dynamic incoming director precisely because of the significant level of top-down support the university has been providing.” He strongly and repeatedly advocates for the elimination of peer-review in a “reimagined” press.

April 20

Professor Speer Morgan (MU English Dept and Editor of *The Missouri Review* literary magazine) writes Graham a six-page memo advocating a new press model that relies on student interns to replace some full-time staff and collaboration with *The Missouri Review* and the School of Journalism to share resources and expertise.

May 24

The UM System issues a press release on strategic priorities. Within the release it is stated: “Achieving these priorities, Wolfe has said, will likely include position eliminations and program reductions across the campuses, including phasing out the University of Missouri Press starting in the 2013 fiscal year.”

May 25

The director of the Association of American University Presses expresses shock that UM did not seek support before deciding to close the Press.

May 28

The “Save the University of Missouri Press” Facebook page is created. At the same time, UM spokeswoman Jennifer Hollingshead said the \$400,000 yearly subsidy of the Press is significant to the university’s budget: “The idea that the Press has unfairly been targeted without efforts to save it is false. Cuts are taking a variety of forms from vice presidents to the Press,” referring to two system-level associate vice president positions that also have been cut (*Columbia Tribune*, May 30, 2012).

June 1

Wolfe speaks publicly about his decision, saying administrators were working hard to develop a new business model for a press. He admits that he had never visited the Press himself, nor had he met with Press staff before his decision.

June 14

Faculty Council discusses the Press action in the context of its timing and shared governance issues.

June 15

Chancellor Deaton and Provost Foster meet with the deans, Speer Morgan, and members of the Executive Committee of Faculty Council. They give the impression that the Press – in some form -- will be established on the MU campus. Details regarding scope, structure, personnel, asset transfers, financing, etc. have not been established.

June 26

A group of Press supporters attend a Board of Curators meeting but, as is typical and routine of Board procedures, were not given time for public comment.

July 1

The “phase out” of the Press begins but no timetable for immediate layoffs is announced.

July 2

Speer Morgan submits a proposal to Chancellor Brady Deaton and Provost Foster with three alternative organizational structures for a new press. Anticipatory five-year budgets are provided.

July 15

Best-selling author, MU PhD, and 2011 MU honorary degree recipient, William Least Heat-Moon publishes a *Tribune* letter to the editor that is critical of the Press closure. The letter is later cited in national news coverage (e.g., *Publishers Weekly*, 08/22/12).

July 16

MU announces plans for a new press model under the direction of English Professor Speer Morgan (author of the April email to Steve Graham).

July 17

The *Tribune* publishes an article about UM Press authors asking that their manuscript/book copyrights be returned to the authors, saying the “new model” isn’t the press they signed on with.

July 19

From a *Tribune* article: “Jennifer Hollingshead said it will be up to those at the new press to determine whether to relinquish rights but that a decision has not been made. If rights aren't returned, it might become a legal matter, which would send the issue back to the UM System.”

July 24

MU’s chapter of the American Association of University Professors hosts a meeting where Press supporters vowed to keep fighting its closure.

July 26

MU Faculty Council votes unanimously to ask President Wolfe to postpone the decision to close the Press pending further discussion.

UM Curator Wayne Goode tells the *Tribune* that he is worried about the negative attention on MU over the situation. He adds that Wolfe “probably made a quick decision based on advice that he got and maybe didn't have a feel for the ramifications.”

Aug. 2

In addressing the Press closure, the Washington headquarters of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) writes to President Wolfe stating: “Our experience has shown that a university suffers when its faculty has come to perceive that its legitimate prerogatives have been disregarded through its exclusion from key decision-making process in which it should play a role.”

Aug. 3

The *Tribune* reports that Wolfe is not going to change his mind about closing the Press but is open to speak with faculty at a meeting called for August 6.

Aug. 6

President Wolfe and senior members of the System meet with the Executive Committee (i.e., officers) of the Faculty Council and Chancellor Deaton to discuss Wolfe's decision to close the Press. During the meeting, President Wolfe said he consulted with chancellors from the four UM campuses but did not reach out to "lower levels." Some faculty members take umbrage at the reference to them as "lower level" employees rather than equal partners in shared governance.

This is also Press Editor-in-Chief Clair Willcox's last workday.

Aug. 7

The AAUP-Missouri Chapter supports the Faculty Council resolution to postpone the Press closing and admonishes UM for a lack of shared governance.

Aug. 8

MU announces the formation of an advisory group under the direction of former Chancellor Richard Wallace to help the Press transition to the MU campus and the new Press model. (Ultimately this becomes a 21-person committee formed on in the September 29, 2012.)

In a separate statement Wolfe said he "is committed to shared governance and realizes now that more faculty and others should have been consulted during the decision-making period surrounding the transition of the Press from System to MU campus."

Aug. 14

The *Tribune* reveals the email exchanges between Professor Speer Morgan, Associate VP Steve Graham, Ben George, Brady Deaton, Brian Foster (March 19, April 20, July 2 as cited above) and publishes them in full.

Aug. 28

Reversing its May 24 decision, the university announces the Press will remain open in its current building with current staff. Administrators say it's simply being shifted from the UM System to the MU campus.

Aug. 29

Reversing its July 16 announcement, MU states that Professor Speer Morgan will not have a role in the management or operation of the Press.

Authors of books in the Press' backlist begin asking that Clair Willcox (Editor-In-Chief until his phase-out in July) be rehired.

Sept. 7

MU Faculty Council members say they want a [root cause analysis](#) to be conducted to better understand how the Press situation happened. This ultimately leads to the creation of the committee that has prepared this report.

Sept. 29

MU announces a 21-member committee to help transition the Press to campus.

Oct. 5

Clair Willcox is rehired as Editor-In-Chief and says his first goal is to repair relationships with authors and series editors who have resigned.

Oct. 6

Peter Givler (Executive Director, Association of American University Presses) congratulates MU and adds: "No organization recovers overnight from the kind of uncertainty and turmoil that has racked the press for the last four months, and even without that turmoil, charting a new course is never easy. AAUP and its members stand ready to offer whatever assistance Clair [Willcox], the Press staff, and the University may need in the months ahead. For today, though, we join them and the citizens of Missouri in celebrating this triumphant rebirth."

Appendix C Sources:

Janese Silvey *Tribune* Blog (http://www.columbiatribune.com/blogs/campus_chatter/um-press-a-look-back/article_265f92eb-47c6-52af-816a-d7e8d4876be6.html)

Columbia Tribune articles

E-mails obtained by the *Tribune* through the Freedom of Information Act

Committee Interviews